

IDAHO COUNCIL ON CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH

Recommendation #2E: By July 1, 2001, the Council will establish a definition of "collaboration" to be agreed upon by the membership and which will serve as a foundation for accountability measurements. This definition will be followed by the local councils upon their establishment.

SUBMITTED TO ICCMH: May 15, 2001

APPROVAL DATE: June 19, 2001

DECISION: The ICCMH adopted the following definition for collaboration and the performance indicators:

Definition of Collaboration: An on-going process among child serving agencies, at all levels, defined by: 1) shared commitment to responsibility and values for children and families with multiple needs and 2) shared planning, training, development and funding of services and systems of care with clearly defined roles for individual agencies and families. Open communication will be demonstrated by the sharing of aggregate data, policies and strategic decision-making regarding systems of care. True collaboration exists when families are full partners.

Performance Indicators

Performance indicators of collaboration will exist on three levels: macro, micro and processes as detailed below:

I. MACRO

1. State level agreement with roles, responsibilities, and expectations of all parties clearly outlined with performance indicators of collaboration outlined in the agreement.
2. Local level agreements based on state level agreements in place and signed by all parties with collaboration indicators committed to in the document.

II. PROCESS INDICATORS—(collaboration will enhance access and receipt of services is the logic model)

1. Department of Juvenile Corrections (DJC) should increase the level of parental participation, as such would improve opportunities for juveniles with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED) to access public mental health services.
2. Collaborative training including parents as trainers and participants
3. Number of children receiving services
4. Number of cross agency staffings: DJC/DHW/local school districts/State Department of Education (SDE)
5. Services:
 - a. Number of children/families trying to access services
 - b. Number of children who are assessed
 - c. Number of children receiving services
 - d. Number of DJC commitments of children with SED -- % of total commitments
6. Open communication demonstrated by sharing of non-client specific data
 - a. Sharing of policies
 - b. Respectful of privacy

III. MICRO - Outcomes for Consumers

1. Increased satisfaction shown on survey instruments.
2. Improved outcomes for individual children on established indicators for councils.

3. Better access as shown by the following:
 - a. Universal use of a satisfaction survey for all who inquire;
 - b. Knowledge adequacy of system at all points of contact;
 - c. How long chronologically it takes to access; and
 - d. How many contacts were required to access.